

8 West Madison Street  
Baltimore, Maryland, 21201  
November 15th, 1973

Lawrence R. Houston, Esquire  
The Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington, D. C., 20505

*No fee  
Harris Smith  
Tim Angleton  
Committee*

Dear Mr. Houston,

I greatly appreciate your kind invitation to meet you on Tuesday. It may simplify matters and save time if I send this letter beforehand to apprise you of the principal problem before us, so that you can consider it.

Princeton has accepted all of our proposals as originally submitted to them. Mr. Dix, the University Librarian, wrote on October 29th, "I am prepared to approve the agreement with one minor insertion. I enclose a general policy statement on acquisition and access which the faculty approved last year... I hope that you and Mrs. Dulles will be willing to insert the prescribed statement in both the agreement and the memorandum of instructions to the Committee at the places which I have indicated."

Unfortunately this insertion is not so "minor." It is a sentence regarding access to the collection which reads as follows:

"It is understood that <sup>solely</sup> in applying these procedures no applicant shall be rejected on the basis of religion, sex, race, national origin, or political views." (Enclosed herewith are xerox copies of the two passages showing this sentence in context.)

On receipt of this I wrote to Mr. John W. Hanes, Jr. on November 6th: "This language seems unexceptionable and in the usual scholastic spirit of these times. But I fear its terms are so broad they would render the committee virtually powerless to control access to the Allen W. Dulles Papers by undesirables. They would seem to take away much of the committee's *raison d'être*, leaving only the function of reviewing published quotations, and to remove in large part whatever protection we can afford these papers. I do not see how even a Russian agent or a notorious subversive, apt to misuse the material, could be denied access under such sweeping provisions."

In response, Mr. Hanes was good enough to come to lunch at Mrs. Dulles's last Monday and to give us the benefit of his experience in administering the John Foster Dulles Papers at Princeton. His advice was as follows:

- I. On no account accept the wording "or political views."
- II. If Princeton insists on retaining the rest of this

language, insert the word "solely" to make the sentence read: "... no applicant shall be rejected solely on the basis of religion, sex" etc. (This change had already occurred to me.)

III. If Princeton insists on this sentence, then it would be necessary to do what had not been done in the case of the John Foster Dulles Papers, namely insert positive instructions in the agreement and memorandum for the committee as to what persons should not be permitted access to the collection. Mr. Hanes wrote out for me a note to this effect:

"Add that access may be denied (or publication prohibited) if 'in the sole discretion of the committee' the purposes of the research (or the publication) are frivolous or unscholarly; or if the purposes, in significant part, are for partisan political objectives of contemporary importance; or are for reasons of embarrassing or denigrating the reputation of living persons; or if the results of the publication (irrespective of the purposes) would, in significant respect, lead to such outcomes. (This provision should be written so that these reasons are not sole reasons simply because they are specifically recited.)"

Mr. Hanes said that this proposed paragraph should be put in better legal language, "with the whereases and so forth," before being submitted to Princeton. He also said, "I would be willing to forego the entire paragraph, if they were willing to forego the entire 'general policy paragraph.'"

This is the principal issue among several points which I would like to discuss with you on Tuesday. I feel a meeting with you will be tremendously worth while, even though Mr. Hanes has been so helpful.

Thanking you,

Sincerely yours,

*F. Garner Ranney*  
F. Garner Ranney